

<b>AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT</b>				1. CONTRACT ID CODE <div style="text-align: center;">J</div>		PAGE OF PAGES <div style="text-align: center;">1   8</div>	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0001		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 05-May-2016		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. N0016116RC16538		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY CODE NAVSUP FLC NORFOLK CONTRACTING NORFOLK OFFICE ATTN: B. NEUMANN 1968 GILBERT ST, SUITE 600 NORFOLK VA 23511-3992		N00189		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) CODE			
				<b>See Item 6</b>			
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)				X		9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. N00189-16-T-0286	
				X		9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 03-May-2016	
						10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
						10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE		FACILITY CODE					
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input type="checkbox"/> is not extended. <p>Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods:          (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted;          or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE          RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN          REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter,          provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.</p>							
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)							
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.							
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.							
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).							
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:							
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)							
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.							
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)							
<p>The purpose of this amendment is to do the following: 1) Extend the offer due date and time to 0600 EST on 19 May 2016. 2) Change the period of performance start date to 27 June 2016. 3) Make various minor changes to the PWS text.</p>							
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.							
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)				16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)			
				TEL: _____ EMAIL: _____			
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR		15C. DATE SIGNED		16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		16C. DATE SIGNED	
_____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)				BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		05-May-2016	

## SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

**SUMMARY OF CHANGES**

## SECTION SF 1449 - CONTINUATION SHEET

## SOLICITATION/CONTRACT FORM

The required response date/time has changed from 11-May-2016 12:00 PM to 19-May-2016 06:00 AM.

## DELIVERIES AND PERFORMANCE

The following Delivery Schedule item for CLIN 0001 has been changed from:

DELIVERY DATE	QUANTITY	SHIP TO ADDRESS	UIC
POP 26-MAY-2016 TO 31-DEC-2016	N/A	USNA INFO TECH SERVICES DEPT BILL PECK 290 BUCHANAN ROAD ANNAPOLIS MD 21402-5045 410-293-1475 FOB: Destination	N00161

To:

DELIVERY DATE	QUANTITY	SHIP TO ADDRESS	UIC
POP 27-JUN-2016 TO 31-DEC-2016	N/A	USNA INFO TECH SERVICES DEPT BILL PECK 290 BUCHANAN ROAD ANNAPOLIS MD 21402-5045 410-293-1475 FOB: Destination	N00161

The following have been modified:

INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS**INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS****I. GENERAL**

The proposal package shall consist of:

## VOLUME I:

Factor I	Technical
----------	-----------

## VOLUME II:

Factor II	Past Performance
Factor III	Price

**IMPORTANT NOTES:**

- (1) In order to ensure that all questions submitted by potential offerors are answered prior to the solicitation closing date, one consolidated list of questions concerning the solicitation should be submitted via e-mail to the contracting point of contact, Brian Neumann, [brian.d.neumann@navy.mil](mailto:brian.d.neumann@navy.mil) **no later than 12:00 pm, NOON, Eastern Standard Time (EST), on 09 May 2016.** The Government reserves the right not to respond to any questions received concerning this solicitation after the questions receipt date above. Accordingly, vendors are encouraged to carefully review all solicitation requirements and submit questions to the Government early in the solicitation timeframe.
- (2) Proposals are due by the date and time shown in Block 8 of the RFQ; and are to be submitted via one of the following methods:

If sent Other than United States Postal Service:

NAVSUP Fleet Logistics Center Norfolk  
Mail and Material Processing Center Code 245.3  
Attn: Brian Neumann, Code 245.1  
9550 Decatur Avenue  
Norfolk, VA 23511-3328

If sent using United States Postal Services:

NAVSUP Fleet Logistics Center Norfolk  
Contracting Department  
Attn: Brian Neumann, Code 245.3  
1968 Gilbert Street, Suite 600  
Norfolk, VA 23511-3392

If using E-mail:

[Brian.d.neumann@navy.mil](mailto:Brian.d.neumann@navy.mil)

## **II. PROPOSAL CONTENT**

The selection of a vendor for award will be based on two PHASES. The evaluation factors are listed below.

### **PHASE I:**

#### **Factor I – Technical**

Contractor and its personnel must meet the minimum qualifications listed below.

#### **Minimum qualifications:**

As referenced in paragraph 9.0 of the PWS;

- The Contractor must be a certified SAP BusinessObjects Partner with a proven track record of success, specifically in migrating from BusinessObjects XI 3.1 to BI Suite 4.x. Additional desirable certifications include SAP BusinessObjects Solutions Provider Partner and/or Silver, Gold, or Platinum Partner.
- Contractor personnel must be certified technicians with at least five (5) years of demonstrated experience as subject matter expert in Administration, Universe Design, and Report Development. Desired certifications at a minimum are Business Intelligence Suite 4.x, Web Intelligence 4.x, and Crystal Reports 2013.

***Offerors whose technical capability are rated “Marginal or Unacceptable” will be rejected and removed from further competition without additional consideration of their past performance and price.***

### **PHASE II:**

**Factor II - Past Performance:**

The offeror shall demonstrate relevant past performance or affirmatively state that it possesses no relevant past performance. Relevant past performance is performance under contracts or efforts within the past five years prior to the solicitation closing date that is the same as or similar to, the scope and magnitude of the work described by this solicitation.

To demonstrate its past performance, the offeror shall identify up to three (3) of its most relevant contracts or efforts within the past five (5) years, and provide any other information the offeror considers relevant to the requirements of the solicitation. Offerors should provide a detailed explanation demonstrating the relevance of the contracts or efforts to the requirements of the solicitation. If subcontractor past performance is provided as part of the three (3) of its most relevant contracts or efforts, the subcontractor past performance will be given weight relative to the scope and magnitude of the aspects of the work under the solicitation that the subcontractor is proposed to perform. Therefore, the offeror's past performance submittal shall detail clearly the aspects of the work in the solicitation that the subcontractor is proposed to perform.

The offeror should complete a "Past Performance Information Form" for each reference submitted. The form is provided as an Attachment to the solicitation.

In addition to the information requested above, offerors shall contact their past performance references and request that each reference complete the attached "Past Performance Report Form" (Attachment to the Solicitation) and e-mail the completed survey form directly to Brian Neumann at [brian.d.neumann@navy.mil](mailto:brian.d.neumann@navy.mil) by the DUE DATE OF THIS SOLICITATION. The Government reserves the right to consider past performance report forms received after the due date of the solicitation and to contact references for verification or additional information.

**Factor III – Price**

This submittal shall include completed solicitation documents and additional supporting documentation described below.

- A complete and signed Standard Form (SF) 1449, "Solicitation/Contract/Order for Commercial Items" and executed copy of Amendments, if applicable.
- RFQ Section "Schedule of Supplies/Services" completed by the offeror
- Unless completed in ORCA, "Representations, Certifications and Other Statements of Offerors" completed by the offeror.

All price and price supporting information shall be contained in the price submittal. No price or pricing information shall be included in any other submittal including cover letters. Vendors are responsible for submitting sufficient information to enable the Government to fully evaluate their price submittal.

## **EVALUATION**

The Government intends to award a Firm Fixed Priced (FFP) type contract to the responsible vendor whose quote represents the best value after evaluation in accordance with the factors in the solicitation.

The Government intends to award solely on the information contained in the quote and is not obligated to seek completion or clarification of individual resumes and past company performance information. The Government intends to award without discussions.

The selection of a vendor for award will be based on two PHASES, as follows:

**PHASE I****(1) Factor I – Technical****PHASE II****(2) Factor II – Past Performance****(3) Factor III - Price**

Quotes will be reviewed in the order identified above. Any quotes identified as “Marginal or Unacceptable” during PHASE I will not continue for review in PHASE II and, subsequently, will no longer be considered for award. During PHASE II, the evaluation of quotes will consider the vendor's past performance to be more important than technical, technical to be more important than price, and technical and past performance, when considered together, to be significantly more important than price.

The following factors shall be used to evaluate quotes:

**PHASE I:****Factor I – Technical**

The purpose of the technical factor is to assess the offeror’s proposed approach and individual resumes to satisfy the Government’s requirements. The evaluation of risk is related to the assessment of the offeror’s proposed technical submittal. Risk, as it pertains to source selection, is the potential for unsuccessful contract performance. The consideration of risk assesses the degree to which a offeror’s proposed approach to achieving the technical factor involves risk of disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, and the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. Risk will be considered in the evaluation of the proposed solution.

For the Technical factor, the rating table identified in Table 1 below will be utilized for the assignment of ratings. The technical evaluations will be based on each offeror’s response to the minimum qualification requirements of “Instructions to Offerors” and the contents of the Performance Work Statement (PWS).

A combined Technical/Risk Rating will be utilized in the evaluation of the proposed solution. The combined technical/risk rating includes consideration of risk in conjunction with the strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies in determining technical ratings. Combined technical/risk evaluations will utilize the combined technical/risk ratings listed in the below ratings tables.

**\*\*Note:** Offerors receiving a rating of “Marginal or Unacceptable” in this factor will be rejected and removed from further competition without additional consideration of their past performance.

**PHASE II****Factor II - Past Performance**

Past performance will be evaluated based on relevancy and confidence.

For the Past Performance factor, the ratings identified in Tables 2 and 3 below, entitled “Past Performance Relevancy Ratings Table” and “Past Performance Confidence Assessment Ratings Table,” respectively will be used for the assignment of ratings for relevancy and confidence assessment. Relevancy includes similarity in scope and magnitude. Offeror's past performance information will be evaluated to determine the quality and usefulness as it applies to performance confidence assessment.

**Past Performance will be assessed as follows:**

Evaluation will focus only on work experience already performed. Work yet-to-be performed, and work prior to the last 5 years, will not be considered.

Past Performance Relevancy Ratings – Regarding relevancy, each past performance reference under each offeror's Past Performance submission will be evaluated to determine its individual scope and magnitude relative to the instant requirement. The following definitions will apply to this evaluation:

- Scope: Experience in the areas defined in the Performance Work Statement (PWS).
- Magnitude: The measure of the similarity of the dollar value of actually performed work that exists between the PWS and the offeror's references.

Offerors lacking relevant past performance history will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance. However, the past performance submittal of a offeror with no relevant past performance history, while not rated favorably or unfavorably for past performance, may not represent the most advantageous offeror to the Government. In this instance, the offeror will receive a rating of "Not Relevant" in the relevancy rating factor.

Past Performance Confidence Assessment Ratings – The overall assigned rating for Past Performance will be the Past Performance Confidence Assessment rating. The assignment of this rating will be based on the quality of the relevant past performance and will consider the currency and relevance of the information, source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in contractor's performance. The quality of performance under a past performance reference that has no relevance to the instant requirement will not be considered in the overall assessment of Past Performance Confidence. In the case of a offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance rather the offeror will receive an "Unknown Confidence" rating.

In order to verify past performance information and determine the quality of the past performance submission, the Government may contact some or all of the references provided, as appropriate, and may collect information through questionnaires (i.e. the Past Performance Report Form), telephone interviews and existing data sources to include but not limited to Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting (CPARS). The Government reserves the right to obtain information for use in the evaluation of past performance from any and all sources including sources outside of the Government. This past performance information will be used for the evaluation of past performance.

This evaluation and rating is separate and distinct from the Contracting Officer's responsibility determination. The assessment of the offeror's past performance will be used as a means of evaluating the relative capability of the offeror and other competitors to successfully meet the requirements of the RFQ. In determining the rating for the past performance evaluation sub-factor, the Government will give greater consideration to the contracts which the Government feels are most relevant to the RFQ.

### **Factor III - Price**

The vendor's proposed price will be evaluated in accordance with FAR 13.106-3(a).

Vendors responding to this solicitation are advised that, prior to award, the government may request vendors to submit information/data to support price reasonableness such as copies of paid invoices for the same or similar items, sales history for the same or similar items, price list with effective date and/or copies of catalog pages along with any applicable discounts. Failure to submit the requested information may result in disqualification of the submitted quote.

Options, to include FAR 52.217-8, will be evaluated pursuant to solicitation provision FAR 52.217-5, Evaluation of Options. The Government will evaluate quotes for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. The Government may determine that a quote is unacceptable if the option prices are significantly unbalanced. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

Although price is the not the most important evaluation factor, it has the potential to become more significant during the evaluation process. The degree of importance of price will increase with the degree of equality of the quotes in

relation to the other factors on which selection is to be based. The importance of price will also increase when a vendor's price is so significantly high as to diminish the value to the Government that might be gained under the other aspects of the offer. If, at any stage of the evaluation, all offerors are determined to have submitted equal, or virtually equal, quotes, price could become the factor in determining which offerors shall receive the award.

### **Rating Table**

The following adjectival ratings shall be used in the evaluation of the proposed solution.

### **Rating Table**

These ratings will be used in the evaluation of the proposed solution.

**TABLE 1**

Rating	Description
Outstanding	Quote meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low.
Good	Quote meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Quote contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Acceptable	Quote meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Marginal*	Quote does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The quote has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Unacceptable**	Quote does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies. Quote is un-awardable

### **DEFINITIONS:**

**Strength** - An aspect of a offeror's quote that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

**Weakness** - A flaw in the quote that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

**Significant Weakness** - A flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

**Deficiency** - A material failure of a quote to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a quote that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

**Risk** – (as it pertains to source selection) The potential for unsuccessful contract performance. The consideration of risk assesses the degree to which a offeror's proposed approach to achieving the technical factor or its sub-factors may involve risk of disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, and the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.

### **Past Performance Relevancy Ratings**

**TABLE 2**

Rating	Description
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

### Past Performance Confidence Assessment Ratings

**TABLE 3**

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Description</b>
Substantial Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Limited Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.
Unknown Confidence (Neutral)	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.

### Source Selection Decision

The Government intends to evaluate quotes and award a contract using the simplified acquisition procedures of FAR Subpart 13.1. The Government shall select the vendor whose quote represents the best value to the Government, considering price and other factors when compared to other vendors. The Government also reserves the right to not award a contract or order if the award is not in the best interest of the Government.

(End of Summary of Changes)